RECORD AND BRIEFS

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT 30 2017
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 16-111

# In The Supreme Court of the United States

MASTERPIECE CAKESHOP, LTD., ET AL.,
*Petitioners,*

v.

COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, ET AL.,

*On Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Colorado*

## BRIEF OF CHEFS, BAKERS, AND RESTAURATEURS AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS

Sarah Warbelow
Legal Director
HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN
1640 Rhode Island Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 572-8981

Pratik A. Shah
*Counsel of Record*
Martine E. Cicconi*
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
1333 New Hampshire Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 887-4000
pshah@akingump.com

* Licensed to practice in California only and under the direct supervision of a partner of Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP who is an enrolled active member of the District of Columbia Bar; applicant for admission to the D.C. Bar.

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

WILSON-EPES PRINTING CO., INC. – (202) 789-0096 – WASHINGTON, D. C. 20002

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE* ..... 1

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT ..... 3

ARGUMENT ..... 5

THE FIRST AMENDMENT DOES NOT ALLOW A CHEF, BAKER, OR OTHER CULINARY ARTIST TO REFUSE TO PROVIDE A GENERALLY OFFERED SERVICE BASED ON THE IDENTITY OF THE CUSTOMER ..... 5

A. The Fact That Food Preparation Involves Talent, Skill, And Artistry Does Not Necessarily Entitle It To First Amendment Protection ..... 5

B. When A Chef Offers Something To The Public, He Must Offer It To All ..... 9

C. There Is No Basis In Law To Recognize An Exception For Weddings Or Wedding Cakes ..... 12

CONCLUSION ..... 17

APPENDIX OF ADDITIONAL *AMICI* ..... 1a

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

**CASES:**

*Cressman v. Thompson*,
798 F.3d 938 (10th Cir. 2015) ..... 7

*Hurley v. Irish-Am. Gay, Lesbian & Bi-Sexual Gr. of Bos., Inc.*,
515 U.S. 557 (1995) ..... 10

*Mastrovincenzo v. City of New York*,
435 F.3d 78 (2d Cir. 2006) ..... 7, 8, 9

*Rex v. Ivens*,
7 Car. & P. 213, 173 Eng. Rep. 94 (N. P. 1835) ..... 10

*Rumsfeld v. Forum for Acad. & Institutional Rights, Inc.*,
547 U.S. 47 (2006) ..... 4, 16

**STATUTES:**

42 U.S.C.
§ 2000a(a) ..... 11
§ 2000a(b)(2) ..... 10

OTHER AUTHORITIES:

Buccafusco, Christopher J., *On the Legal Consequences of Sauces: Should Thomas Keller's Recipes Be* Per Se *Copyrightable*, 24 CARDOZO ARTS & ENT. L.J. 1121 (2007) ..... 7

Fauchart, Emmanuelle & Eric von Hippel, *Norms-Based Intellectual Property Systems: The Case of French Chefs*, 19 ORG. SCI. 187 (2008) ..... 6

Harris, Anne-Marie G., *A Survey of Federal and State Public Accommodations Statutes: Evaluating Their Effectiveness in Cases of Retail Discrimination*, 13 VA. J. SOC. POL'Y & L. 331 (2006) ..... 11

Huen, Eustacia, *World's Best Chefs Share Their Proudest Dish*, FORBES (Mar. 3, 2015) ..... 6

Lerman, Lisa G. & Annette K. Sanderson, *Comment: Discrimination in Access to Public Places: A Survey of State and Federal Public Accommodations Laws*, 7 N.Y.U. REV. OF L. & SOC. CHANGE 215 (1978) ..... 10

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

No. 16-111

MASTERPIECE CAKESHOP, LTD., ET AL.,
*Petitioners*,

v.

COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, ET AL.,,

*On Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Colorado*

# BRIEF OF CHEFS, BAKERS, AND RESTAURATEURS AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS

## INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE*[1]

*Amici* are a group of 222 leading chefs, bakers, and restaurateurs from across the country. They submit this brief to convey their first-hand perspective, as culinary artists, on why application of public accommodation laws in cases such as this one do not impinge on the core expressive exercise of their talent and skill.

*Amici* include:

[1] This brief is filed with the written consent of all parties through universal or individual letters of consent on file with the Clerk. No counsel for either party authored this brief in whole or in part, nor did any party or other person make a monetary contribution to the brief's preparation or submission.

- Jose Andres, chef and owner of ThinkFoodGroup;
- Katherine Kallinis Berman and Sophie Kallinis LaMontagne, co-founders of Georgetown Cupcake in Washington, DC;
- Anthony Bourdain, chef, author, and host of Anthony Bourdain: Part's Unknown;
- Tom Colicchio, chef, owner of Crafted Hospitality, and head judge of Top Chef;
- Elizabeth Falkner, chef and restaurateur;
- Duff Goldman, chef and owner of Charm City Cakes in Baltimore, MD;
- Carla Hall, chef and co-host of The Chew;
- Sam Kass, former Assistant White House Chef and Senior Policy Advisor for Nutrition Policy to President Barack Obama;
- Padma Lakshmi, author and host of Top Chef;
- Marcus Samuelson, chef and owner of Red Rooster in New York, NY;
- Christina Tosi, chef and owner of Momofuku Milk Bar in Washington, DC.

Additional *amici* are listed in the appendix.

## INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

For some people, cooking is a chore. For others, it is a hobby. For professional chefs, bakers, and restaurateurs (collectively herein, "chefs"), including *amici*, it is much more. It is a way to display talent and skill honed over years of study and practice. It is a way to introduce patrons to new flavor combinations and culinary techniques. And it is a way for chefs to convey their perspective to the world.

Notwithstanding the talent and skill required to create fine cuisine, and the expression that may flow from it, *amici* acknowledge that food preparation is not a core First Amendment activity. Even when prepared by celebrated chefs, food retains a clear purpose apart from its expressive component: it is made to be eaten. For that reason, food products (and their preparation) are not necessarily protected by the First Amendment. Of course, chefs or other artists may use edible media to convey an expressive message; where (unlike here) the primary purpose and effect is to convey the chefs' or artists' own message (*e.g.*, creating a peace sign out of cupcakes as a personal war protest), the activity would implicate their First Amendment rights. In most cases, however, culinary creations may appropriately be viewed as commercial goods not imbued with First Amendment protection.

In any event, the First Amendment does not allow a chef or other culinary artist to exempt himself from generally applicable laws that do not target expressive activity. Public accommodation laws like Colorado's Anti-Discrimination Act have been a

staple in the food service industry for decades. Chefs and other culinary professionals are aware of the obligations those laws impose when they enter the business.

Moreover, compliance with public accommodation laws does not stifle a chef's creativity. Chefs retain discretion to choose the cuisine they prepare and the menu items and services they offer. Anti-discrimination laws merely demand that chefs and others treat all customers equally: what is offered to some must be offered to all.

There is no basis in law or logic to carve out an exception to these norms for weddings or for wedding cakes. That is particularly true where, as here, the refusal to serve a same-sex couple extends to making *any* wedding cake—including one *identical* in every way to that offered to opposite-sex couples. Contrary to petitioners' (and the United States') contention, the centrality of a cake in a wedding celebration does not inevitably associate the baker with the celebration or the couple getting married. Rather, as this Court has repeatedly recognized, audiences can separate the views of a speaker (here, the couple celebrating their marriage) from the perspective of one who is providing a generally available service in compliance with the law. *See Rumsfeld v. Forum for Acad. & Institutional Rights, Inc.*, 547 U.S. 47, 65 (2006).

At bottom, petitioners ask this Court for broad constitutional immunity from long-established laws prohibiting discrimination on the basis of protected characteristics. Because Jack Phillips is not unique in the talent, skill, and expression he displays in his

craft, affording such immunity to Phillips necessarily means affording it to countless other creative professionals. Such a sweeping exemption from public accommodation laws would upend anti-discrimination norms accepted throughout the country, to the detriment of historically disfavored minority groups—including, as here, same-sex couples. Rather than open that Pandora's box, this Court should reaffirm the principles of equality and fairness that have led Congress and legislatures in virtually every state to enshrine protection from discrimination into law.

## ARGUMENT

### THE FIRST AMENDMENT DOES NOT ALLOW A CHEF, BAKER, OR OTHER CULINARY ARTIST TO REFUSE TO PROVIDE A GENERALLY OFFERED SERVICE BASED ON THE IDENTITY OF THE CUSTOMER

#### A. The Fact That Food Preparation Involves Talent, Skill, And Artistry Does Not Necessarily Entitle It To First Amendment Protection

1. While for some, cooking is a mundane task, for others, like *amici*, it is a display of talent and skill. Mastering many cooking styles requires years of training and practice. And creating dishes served in the world's finest restaurants—many of which resemble works of art—demands creativity, imagination, patience, and expertise.

To many chefs, cooking is also a means of self-expression. Some of the world's most acclaimed chefs serve dishes that define their culinary styles and

showcase their unique perspectives. Through these dishes, chefs reveal their personal histories, the flavor and color combinations that speak to them, and the experiences in their lives that have shaped them as chefs and individuals. Consider, for example, Chef Alaine Ducasse's description of his seasonal vegetables crockpot:

> This dish is an illustration of my culinary story, which began when I was a child picking vegetables out of my grandmother's garden. For years, I have always wanted to create a signature dish with my favorite vegetables, as they are the thread that connects my life experience with the diverse, sensory experience found at my restaurants.[2]

As this description shows, dishes conceived and prepared by skilled chefs are more than a collection of ingredients—they are a product of years of thoughtful preparation and, in some cases, a window into the mind and soul of the chef that created them. Given the talent and creativity required to produce these culinary feats, it is not surprising that norms in the cooking industry recognize recipes and food presentation as the creative product of the chefs that develop them. *See* Emmanuelle Fauchart & Eric von Hippel, *Norms-Based Intellectual Property Systems:*

---

[2] Eustacia Huen, *World's Best Chefs Share Their Proudest Dish*, FORBES (Mar. 3, 2015), *available at* https://www.forbes.com/sites/eustaciahuen/2015/03/03/chef-alain-ducasse-daniel-humm-yannick-alleno-other-world-class-chefs-share-their-proudest-dish/#d586cb372ff0

*The Case of French Chefs*, 19 ORG. SCI. 187 (2008); *see also* Christopher J. Buccafusco, *On the Legal Consequences of Sauces: Should Thomas Keller's Recipes Be* Per Se *Copyrightable*, 24 CARDOZO ARTS & ENT. L.J. 1121, 1154 (2007) ("Culinary history has long had a custom of attributing a new dish to the chef who created it, and this practice remains in force today. Aspiring chefs are taught to respect the rights of other chefs when using their recipes.").

2. Notwithstanding the skill, imagination, and personality chefs display in their cooking, that activity is not necessarily entitled to First Amendment protection. Following this Court's precedents, courts of appeals have held that even when "an item possesses expressive elements" (and even when it "could be labeled 'art'"), courts should determine "whether that item also has a common non-expressive purpose or utility." *Mastrovincenzo v. City of New York*, 435 F.3d 78, 92, 95 (2d Cir. 2006). "Where an object's dominant purpose is expressive, the vendor of such an object has a stronger claim to protection under the First Amendment; conversely, where an object has a dominant non-expressive purpose, it will be classified as a 'mere commercial good[],' the sale of which likely falls outside the scope of the First Amendment." *Id.* at 95 (alteration in original) (citation omitted); *see also Cressman v. Thompson*, 798 F.3d 938, 952-954 (10th Cir. 2015) (in assessing whether First Amendment protection attaches, "courts, on a case-by-case basis, must determine whether the 'disseminators of [an image] are genuinely and primarily engaged in *** self-expression'") (alternation and ellipsis in original) (quoting *Mastrovincenzo*, 435 F.3d at 91). For

example, "[a] cufflink fastens the cuff and keeps the shirtsleeve from crowding the wrist; a pot serves as a tidy and dry depository for food and other objects, and cutlery (or, for that matter, a silver plate), even if wrought with substantial skill and artistry, most often serves a predominantly non-expressive purpose." *Mastrovincenzo*, 435 F.3d at 95.

Even when prepared by renowned chefs, food retains a clear non-expressive purpose—namely, consumption. No matter how intricate, creative, and aesthetically pleasing a dish might be, it is not designed to be displayed in perpetuity, but rather to be served and eaten. With a clear "non-expressive purpose," food items may be appropriately "classified as *** 'commercial good[s],' the sale of which likely falls outside the scope of the First Amendment." *Mastrovincenzo*, 435 F.3d at 95.

The same is true of Phillips's wedding cakes. Regardless of the creativity of his designs or the skill with which he executes them, Phillips's customers purchase a product intended to be consumed. If that were not the case, there would be no reason for Phillips to "write[], paint[], and sculpt[] using mostly edible materials like icing and fondant rather than ink and clay." Pet. Br. 20. For that reason, the comparison to "abstract painting[s] *** [and] modern sculpture[s]," Pet. Br. 20-21—items that presumably have no purpose other than to reveal the expression of the artist—is inapt.

To be sure, a sculpture or painting made with edible media may make a political or societal statement just as surely as a piece made with traditional materials. And even if the creation is

perishable, First Amendment protection may well attach if the artist's predominant purpose was expressive. Take a baker, for example, that creates a peace sign out of cupcakes as a display of his *own* anti-war views. But such predominantly and personally expressive activity is far removed from Phillips's cakes, which are valued for their flavors and textures in addition to their aesthetic or expressive qualities, and are designed primarily to further the *customers'* ends. Like other items "with non-expressive uses," whether First Amendment protection applies to Phillips's wedding cakes depends on whether "these non-expressive uses are secondary to the [cakes'] expressive or communicative characteristics." *Mastrovincenzo*, 435 F.3d at 96. If not, Phillips's commercial activity should not entitle him to First Amendment protection.

### B. When A Chef Offers Something To The Public, He Must Offer It To All

1. Whether or not the creation of cakes or other food products implicates the First Amendment, any such protection does not entitle a chef to violate laws and regulations that do not target expressive activity. A chef may not evade health laws that preclude the use of certain unsafe ingredients on the ground that he prefers to cook with them. Similarly, a chef may not violate worker safety laws on the ground that his preferred cooking methods call for dangerous equipment.

By the same token, a chef may not invoke the First Amendment to avoid anti-discrimination laws simply because serving particular classes of customers conflicts with his personal beliefs. Public

accommodations laws like the one at issue in this case "ha[ve] a venerable history," deriving from "common law." *Hurley v. Irish-Am. Gay, Lesbian & Bi-Sexual Gr. of Bos., Inc.*, 515 U.S. 557, 571 (1995). "As one of the 19-century English judges put it, the rule was that '[t]he innkeeper is not to select his guests[;] [h]e has no right to say to one, you shall come into my inn, and to another you shall not, as every one coming and conducting himself in a proper manner has a right to be received; and for this purpose innkeepers are a sort of public servants." *Id.* (quoting *Rex v. Ivens*, 7 Car. & P. 213, 219, 173 Eng. Rep. 94, 96 (N. P. 1835)) (alterations in original).

From these common-law roots, public accommodation laws have evolved to prohibit discrimination based on various protected characteristics, including (in some U.S. jurisdictions) sexual orientation. Regardless of the particular protected characteristic, such laws overwhelming apply to restaurants and other food-service establishments. Since its enactment in 1964, the federal Civil Rights Act has prohibited discrimination in "any restaurant, cafeteria, lunchroom, lunch counter, soda fountain, or other facility principally engaged in selling food for consumption on the premises." 42 U.S.C. § 2000a(b)(2). By 1978, all 38 states with public accommodation statutes guaranteed access to restaurants and similar entities. [3] Today, nearly all states preclude

---

[3] *See* Lisa G. Lerman & Annette K. Sanderson, *Comment: Discrimination in Access to Public Places: A Survey of State and Federal Public Accommodations Laws*, 7 N.Y.U. REV. OF L. & SOC. CHANGE 215, 247 (1978).

restaurants from discriminating against would-be customers.[4]

Critically, discrimination based on protected characteristics is not limited to the categorical refusal to serve customers. With the obligation to serve all comes the obligation to provide equal treatment when offering service. *See, e.g.*, 42 U.S.C. § 2000a(a) ("All persons shall be entitled to the *full and equal* enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations of any place of public accommodation.") (emphasis added). Accordingly, a chef cannot refuse to sell certain customers some of the items on their menus. If a chef offers a special dessert for Valentine's Day, he cannot refuse to serve that dessert to an interracial couple. Similarly, chefs cannot refuse to host events for some customers that they would host for others. If a restaurant is willing to open its doors for a sweet-sixteen party, it cannot refuse to host a *quinceanera*.

2. Despite these basic anti-discrimination obligations, culinary artists have broad license to express themselves. Chefs can specialize in any sort of cuisine they choose, whether from a particular country or region—or a combination of several—or based on certain flavors and cooking techniques. They can choose to cook only vegetarian dishes, or to serve meat ranging from the mundane to the exotic.

---

[4] *See* Anne-Marie G. Harris, *A Survey of Federal and State Public Accommodations Statutes: Evaluating Their Effectiveness in Cases of Retail Discrimination*, 13 VA. J. SOC. POL'Y & L. 331, 340 (2006) (noting that 45 out of 50 states prohibit discrimination in places of public accommodation).

They may include as many or as few items on their menus as they desire.

Public accommodation laws do not stifle this freedom. Such laws do not compel chefs or other culinary artists to create dishes they do not wish to create and do not offer to others. No anti-discrimination law would require a vegan chef to serve meat, or a kosher restaurant to offer a shellfish item. No such law would compel a baker to offer a flavor or appliqué he did not wish to use. And if a baker chooses, as a general matter, not to write messages on his creations, a public accommodation law would not compel him to do so in order to comply with non-discrimination requirements.

Rather, public accommodation laws simply mandate equal access. When a chef or other culinary artist offers an item or service for sale, he must offer it to all customers. That anti-discrimination obligation is neither surprising nor burdensome. Given the established nature of such laws, chefs are aware of their obligation to serve all customers when they enter the business. Any claim that following such laws will chill expressive activities is therefore unfounded. Compliance with anti-discrimination laws does not require a chef to suppress his creativity; it merely compels him to channel that creativity in a way that serves all patrons equally.

### C. There Is No Basis In Law To Recognize An Exception For Weddings Or Wedding Cakes

1. Petitioners describe in detail the time, skill, and care Phillips takes in creating wedding cakes. Moreover, they argue, his "custom wedding cakes are

his artistic expression because he intends to, and does in fact, communicate through them." Pet. Br. 19.

But Phillips is not unique in his intention or ability to express himself through cooking. As described above, many chefs view cooking as an act of expression and many create dishes that can and do convey a personal message. Hence, accepting petitioners' position that First Amendment protection attaches to Phillips's creations would subject a wide variety of laws affecting food preparation to heightened scrutiny.

By the same token, weddings are not the only events chefs and other creative professionals serve that have expressive meaning—the same might be said of anniversary parties, baby showers, first communions, bar mitzvahs, and graduations, to name just a few. Accordingly, the position petitioners and the United States advance—which turns on the expressive nature of the product and the event—would allow countless bakeries, restaurants, caterers, other creative businesses to opt out of anti-discrimination laws. For example, under petitioners' rule, a baker could refuse, based on religious views, to provide a cake for an anniversary party or baby shower for a same-sex couple, and could also refuse to serve an interfaith couple if creating a cake for their celebration required him to "create expression that he considers objectionable." Pet. Br. 27. For the same reason, a chef could refuse to cater a bar mitzvah even if he would cater a religious celebration for customers of a different faith. Such sweeping immunity from public accommodation laws would upend anti-discrimination norms accepted

throughout the country, to the detriment of historically disfavored minority groups.

2. The United States' effort to narrow the scope of the rule it endorses is unavailing. To start, the distinction the United States draws between so-called off-the-shelf products and "custom" products is nebulous in the culinary realm—food is often made to order rather than pre-made. And even if some dishes are more specifically tailored to a customer's preferences, that distinction is apparently immaterial to the federal government. After all, the facts of this case show that Phillips declined to create *any* wedding cake for the same-sex couple, including one *identical* to cakes he created for opposite-sex couples. *See* Pet. App. 75 (Phillips "categorically refused" to accept the cake order "before there was any discussion about what that cake would look like *** . [He] was not asked to apply any message or symbol to the cake."); *see also* Pet. App. 279 (as an alternative to requesting a unique design, Phillips's customers may select an existing—in other words, off-the-shelf—design).[5]

---

[5] The United States also argues that its rule will not sweep too broadly because some states and the federal government limit anti-discrimination laws to entities that serve food on their premises. That is unpersuasive. First, Colorado is not alone in applying its anti-discrimination law more broadly. Second, as described above, the government's rule would apply equally to restaurateurs who do not wish to hold certain "expressive events" (*e.g.*, same-sex wedding receptions, anniversary parties, or engagement parties) in their restaurants. Hence, regardless of the sweep of certain public accommodation laws, the impact of the rule the federal government advances is anything but narrow.

In any event, this argument rests on a flawed premise. The fact that a chef customizes an item or a menu to a customer's preference does not mean that he endorses the customer's life choices, or even that he supports the event for which the food is prepared. Chefs do not inquire into the life choices or personal views of their patrons before serving their meals—even meals specially prepared to celebrate a milestone. And although petitioners state that Phillips's services include consultation with his customers to learn their "desires, personalities, preferences, and wedding details," Pet. Br. 8, even petitioners do not claim Phillips investigates whether each couple whose wedding he services shares his views on marriage and family. Petitioners do not claim, for example, that Phillips takes steps to assure himself that his customers intend to be faithful to each other throughout their marriage. Rather, like all chefs and other creative professionals, Phillips provides a service upon request to customers whose lives remain, for the most part, a mystery to him.

It is also no answer to claim that the circumstances of this case are *sui generis* because of the role a cake plays in a wedding. Even accepting the view that a wedding cake is uniquely important to the event (a tenuous claim at best given the role cakes play in many celebrations), that argument fails. No matter how central the cake is to the wedding celebration, the baker of that cake has no such centrality. Rather, the cake baker does not participate in the wedding ceremony or the celebration any more than the caterer who provides the dinner, the owner of the venue that hosts it, the bridal shop that makes a bride's dress, the florist that

provides the flowers, or the hair dresser who styles the hair. As this Court has recognized, audiences are well-equipped to distinguish between views being expressed by a speaker (here, the couple marrying) and one who performs a service in compliance with generally applicable laws. *Cf. Forum for Acad. & Institutional Rights*, 547 U.S. at 65. There is no reason to deviate from that rule for cake bakers, florists, dress makers, or any other wedding vendor who provides a service in exchange for a fee.

3. In addition to its sweeping scope, the rule petitioners and the United States advocate suffers from another flaw: it will disproportionately harm same-sex couples. Although petitioners' claim is couched broadly in Phillips's religious beliefs, the practical import of the position petitioners and the federal government advocate is that same-sex couples will be excluded from services offered to others. When approaching a chef, baker, or restaurateur in the hopes of procuring their services for a wedding, anniversary, or other event that celebrates their life as a couple, same-sex partners are unable to hide their sexual orientation. By contrast, another couple whose marriage Phillips might not support—such as a couple intending to have an "open marriage" or even a couple entering into an interfaith marriage—need not reveal the aspect of their life he is likely to denounce. Such unequal treatment, on the basis of sexual orientation, is exactly what the Colorado legislature intended to prohibit when it enacted the Anti-Discrimination Act. This Court should not allow Phillips to flout that judgment.

Instead, this Court should hold that where, as here, a chef or other artist who engages in

commercial activity is not asked to create a product that he would decline to create for any other patron, the First Amendment does not give him the right to refuse service in violation of public accommodation laws.

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the decision below should be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted.

Sarah Warbelow
Legal Director
HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN

Pratik A. Shah
*Counsel of Record*
Martine E. Cicconi*
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS
HAUER & FELD LLP

* Licensed to practice in California only and under the direct supervision of a partner of Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP who is an enrolled active member of the District of Columbia Bar; applicant for admission to the D.C. Bar.

October 30, 2017

# APPENDIX

## APPENDIX OF ADDITIONAL *AMICI*

The following *amici* also join this brief:

- Benjamin Adler of The Skinny Pancake in Burlington, VT;
- Erin Archuleta of ICHI Sushi in San Francisco, CA;
- Tim Archuleta of ICHI Sushi in San Francisco, CA;
- Jessica Arneson of Red River Coffee Co. in Fargo, ND;
- Jason Babb of American Cut Steakhouse in Atlanta, GA;
- Greg Baker of The Refinery and Fodder & Shine in Tampa, FL;
- Josey Baker of Josey Baker Bread and The Mill in San Francisco, CA;
- Natalia Banjac of Nothing Bundt Cakes in Tulsa, OK;
- Christina Barber of Velvet Sky Bakery in Jenkintown, PA;
- Kim Bartmann of the Bartmann Group in Minneapolis, MN;

- Chia Basinger of Sweet Action Ice Cream in Denver, CO;
- Sarah Bates of The Hot Club in Providence, RI;
- Julia Battaglini of Secco Wine bar in Richmond, VA;
- Kurt Beadell of Vibrant Group Catering in Portland, OR;
- Matthew Bell of South on Main in Little Rock, AR;
- Meagan Benz of Crust Vegan Bakery in Philadelphia, PA;
- Mitch Berliner of MeatCrafters in Landover, MD;
- Dorina Bernardo of TPR Restaurant in Tenafly, NJ;
- Bob Bernstein of Bongo Bakery in Nashville, TN;
- Sondra Bernstein of the Girl & the Fig in Sonoma, CA;
- Pamela Berry of Shepherdstown Sweet Shop Bakery in Shepherdstown, WV;

- Kathleen Blake of The Rusty Spoon in Orlando, FL;
- Elizabeth Blau of Blau + Associates in Las Vegas, NV;
- John Blomgren of Back to Eden Bakery in Portland, OR;
- Bill Blum of MacArthur Place in Sonoma, CA;
- Lucy Bonds of Lucy's Coffee & Tea in Birmingham, AL;
- Ben Brainard of Yellow Rocket Concepts in Little Rock, AR;
- Heather Bray of The Lowbrow in Minneapolis, MN;
- Robert Brown of Rockmere Lodge in Ogunquit, ME;
- Erik Bruner-Yang of Maketto in Washington, DC;
- Emily Bruno of Denizens Brewing Co. in Silver Spring, MD;
- Sandra Bubbert of The Acadian Bakers in Houston, TX;

- Jeste Burton of Pie in the Sky Bakery and Cafe of Juneau, AK;
- Bethany Caliaro of Pastaio in Providence, RI;
- Danielle Callahan of Grown Up Treats LLC in Chester, PA;
- Joshua Campbell of Django Western Taco in Cincinnati, OH;
- Javier Candon of Joselito Casa de Comida in Washington, DC;
- Stefanie Carr of Durk's Bar-B-Q in Providence, RI;
- Amy Cavanaugh of Limones in Asheville, NC;
- Kerry Chao of Poke Papa in Washington, DC;
- Jared Cohen of West Avenue Restaurant in Dresher, PA;
- Scott Conant of Scott Conant Restaurants in New York, NY;
- Candace Conley of The Girl Can Cook! in Broken Arrow, OK;

- Lupita Corbeil of Den-Tex Central in San Antonio, TX;
- Travis Cummings of Brown Box Meals in Dallas, TX;
- Laura Davis of The Brew House in Cincinnati, OH;
- Nils Davis of Bites on Broadway in Skagway, AK;
- Emile Defelice of Soda City in Columbia, SC;
- Tom DeGree of Wilde Cafe and Spirits in Minneapolis, MN;
- Agnes Devereux of The Village Tearoom Inc. in New Paltz, NY;
- Linde Di Lello Morton of Terra Plata in Seattle, WA;
- Kelly Doran of Gracie's in Providence, RI;
- Steven Dorcelien of Bright Yellow Creamery in Philadelphia, PA;
- Lisa Dougherty of Buttercup Cakes LLC in Sewell, NJ;

- Jana Douglass of Happy Chicks Bakery in Cincinnati, OH;
- Lissa Doumani or Terra in St. Helena, CA;
- Steve Durkee of Durk's Bar-B-Q in Providence, RI;
- Elizabeth Ehrenberg of The Gleanery in Putney, VT;
- Jennifer Emerson of Local 463 Urban Kitchen in Ridgeland, MS;
- Derek Emerson of Walker's Drive In, Local 463, CAET Wine Bar, and Parlor Market in Jackson, MS;
- Leigh Enderle of Maribelle's Eat + Drink in Cincinnati, OH;
- Nicole Endrikat Matos of Queen Bee Pastry in Philadelphia, PA;
- Duskie Estes of Zazu Kitchen + Farm in Sebastopol, CA;
- Nima Etemadi of Cake Life Bake Shop in Philadelphia, PA;

- Joshua Even of Tosca Cafe and 242 Columbus Ave, LLC in San Francisco, CA;
- Heather Fields of River City Sweets in Glen Allen, VA;
- Lily Fischer of Cake Life Bake Shop in Philadelphia, PA;
- Jean-Francois Flechet of Taste of Belgium in Cincinnati, OH;
- Kevin Fonzo of La Tavola in Orlando, FL;
- George Formano of Orchestrate Hospitality in Des Moines, IA;
- Katina Foster of Sweet Magnolias Bake Shop in Omaha, NE;
- Emily Frank of Share Cheesebar and C'est Cheese Food Truck in Cincinnati, OH;
- Angela Garbacz of Goldenrod Pastries in Lincoln, NE;
- Randy George of Red Hen Baking Co. in Middlesex, VT;

- Cesraq Gerena of Ross' Grill in Provincetown, MA;
- Rob Gerhart of Louisiana Pizza Kitchen Uptown in New Orleans, LA;
- Dean Gold of Dino's Grotto in Washington, DC;
- Daniel Greenblatt of Greenleaf Restaurant in Ashland, OR;
- Trina Gregory-Propst of Se7enbites in Orlando, FL;
- Ruth Gresser of Pizzeria Paradiso in Alexandria, VA;
- Carole Griffin of Continental Bakery in Birmingham, AL;
- Zach Gutweiler of Reeds Hollow in Des Moines, IA;
- Mark Haley of Above and Beyond Catering, Inc. in Boston, MA;
- Howard Hanna of The Rieger in Kansas City, MO;
- Kevin Hart of Chef's Table Catering in Philadelphia, PA;

- Marypat Heineman of DISH Restaurant in Lincoln, NE;
- Laurel Herman, author of THE INNER KITCHEN of Henrico, VA;
- Susan Hershberg of Wiltshire Pantry in Louisville, KY;
- Donald Hitchcock of Lost River Trading Post in Wardensville, WV;
- Richard Hogan of Culinaragourmet in New Hope, PA;
- Shavone Holt of City Farm Company in Nashville, TN;
- Ashley Holtzclaw of Ashley Sue's Baked Goods in Atlanta, GA;
- Mark Howard of Howard Kelly Concepts d/b/a Bliss ReBar and MTM Concepts d/b/a FEZ Restaurant & Bar in Phoenix, AZ;
- Mark Hunker of JAM Bistro in Rehoboth Beach, DE;
- Julia Izenberh of Izenberg's Deli, Bakery, Catering, & Restaurant in Conshohocken, PA;

- Tom Kaplan of Wolfgang Puck Fine Dining Group in Las Vega, NV;
- Penny Karas of Sweet P Confections in Washington, DC;
- Douglas Katz of Fire Food and Drink in Cleveland, OH;
- Emma Kiser of Wardensville Garden Bakering in Wardensville, WV;
- Derek Kitchen of Laziz Kitchen in Salt Lake City, UT;
- Dan Kluger of Loring Place in New York, NY;
- Kurt Kretschmar of Cocktail Caterers in New York, NY;
- Dave Krick of Bittercreek Alehouse in Boise, ID;
- Melissa Krumbein of Kitchen Thyme in Richmond, VA;
- Shane Landry of Connie's Bakery & Catering in Provincetown, MA;
- Laura Lane-Ruckman of Bridges Cafe & Catering in Portland, OR;

- Tom Lane-Ruckman of Bridges Cafe & Catering in Portland, OR;
- Richard Langston of RM Restaurants LLC in Boise, ID;
- Wendy Larson of Slates Restaurant and Bakery in Hallowell, ME;
- Natalie Latour of Chocolats Latour LLC in Cincinnati, OH;
- Kim Laughlin of Park Avenue Pastries in Chalfont, PA;
- Nick Leahy of Saltyard in Atlanta, GA;
- Lindsey Lee of Cargo Coffee in Madison, WI;
- Alex Levin of Schlow Restaurant Group in Washington, DC;
- Susan Limb of Praline Bakery, LLC in Bethesda, MD;
- Joyce Liu of Tosca Cafe in San Francisco, CA;
- Joe Logsdon of La Mie Bakery-Cafe in Des Moines, IA;

- Jennifer Low of The Frosted Fox Cake Shop in Philadelphia, PA;
- Brandy Lueders of The Grateful Chef in Des Moines, IA;
- Jennifer Luxmoore of Sin Desserts in Providence, RI;
- Jason Lyon of Flatbread Company in Amesbury, MA;
- Marrin Maher of Rogue Restaurant Group in Richmond, VA;
- Robert Maher of Rogue Restaurant Group in Richmond, VA;
- Andrew Markert of Beucherts Saloon in Washington, DC;
- Katharine March of Big Tree Hospitality in Portland, ME;
- Kimmee Masi of Confections of a Rockstar Bakery in Asbury Park, NJ;
- Scott McKenzie of Scott McKenzie Catering & Events in Wayzata, MN;
- Robert McMahon of Eberly McMahon Copetas LLC in Cincinnati, OH;

- Amy McMillan of Bohemian Wood Fire Pizza in Tulsa, OH;
- Jim Mecca of Bosque Baking Company in Albuquerque, NM;
- Roger Meier of The Baker & Butcher in Honolulu, HI;
- Suzy Menard of Via Umbria in Washington, DC;
- Claire Meneely of Dozen Bakery in Nashville, TN;
- Robbin Moler of ShadowMoss in Charleston, SC;
- Rom Moonguaklang of Pom Pom Teahouse and Sanwicheria in Orlando, FL;
- Marco Morosjni of Silvertron Cafe in Birmingham, AL;
- Patrick Mulvaney of Mulvaney's Building & Loan in Sacramento, CA;
- Tamara Murphy of Terra Plata in Seattle, WA;
- Rochelle Myers of Rochelle Myers Catering in Leesburg, VA;

- Steven Nawalany of Lipkins Bakery in Philadelphia, PA;
- Laura Norris of Cucina della Ragazza in Kansas City, MO;
- Brian Noyes of Red Truck Bakery in Marshall, VA;
- David O'Neill of The Robins Cellars in Richmond, VA;
- Patrick O'Connell of The Inn at Little Washington in Washington, VA;
- Georgiana Olson of Pheasant Restaurant in Brookings, SD;
- Chris Pappas of Puritan Backroom Restaurant in Manchester, NH;
- Capi Peck of Trio's in Little Rock, AR;
- Chris Powell of Orange Door Hospitality in Acton, MA;
- Rachael Ratliff of Little Lark in Cheyenne, WY;
- Steven Rivelis of The Elephant in Baltimore, MD;

- Richard Rosenthal of the Max Restaurant Group in Hartford, CT;
- James Rua of Cafe Capriccio in Albany, NY;
- Serena Rundberg of Inspired Madness, Inc. d/b/a The Nova Cafe in Bozeman, MT;
- Jose Salazar of Salazar Restaurant in Cincinnati, OH;
- Anne Sexton of the Bartmann Group in Minneapolis, MN;
- George Scharefer of Poppi's Anatolia in Eugene, OR;
- Teri Scheff of Artrageous Desserts in Cincinnati, OH;
- Brian Scherle of Browndog Creamery in Northville, MI;
- Lisa Schroeder of Mother's Bistro & Bar in Portland, OR;
- Jenny Schwarz of Hopscotch Oakland in Oakland, CA;
- Gordon Scott or Scott's Jamaican Bakery in Hartford, CT;

- Joe Scully of Westmoreland & Scully in Asheville, NC;
- Lacey Sher of 200 Uva LLC in Oakland, CA;
- Joni Sherman of Sprouts in Cininnati, OH;
- David Sierra of Joselito Casa de Comidas in Washington, DC;
- Andrew Silva of Mirabelles in Burlington, VT;
- Derek Simcik of Thompson Seattle in Seattle, WA;
- Cate Sisco of Sisco Enterprises LLC d/b/a Piece of Cake in Evansville, IN;
- Ellen Slattery of Gracie's Venture in Providence, RI;
- Karen Small of Flying Fig and Market at the Fig in Cleveland, OH;
- Bill Smith of Crook's Corner in Chapel Hill, NC;
- Alane Spinney of Gracie's Venture in Providence, RI;

- Francine Starke of Navarre in Portland, OR;
- Keeley Steele of Bluegrass Kitchen in Charleston, WV;
- Mariel Street of Liberty Burger in Dallas, TX;
- Pamela Student of Prospect Restaurant in San Francisco, CA;
- Jack Sundell of The Root Cafe in Little Rock, AR;
- Chris Svoboda of Svolicious Dishes in Richmond, VA;
- Daniel Swenson-Klatt of Butter Bakery Cafe Inc. in Minneapolis, MN;
- Tony Tausch of Coffee Emporium in Cincinnati, OH;
- Arnold Teixeira of The Starving Artist at Days Restaurant in Ocean Grove, NJ;
- Christian Thornton of Atria Martha's Vineyard in Edgartown, MA;
- Carol Todd of Market Roost Catering, Restaurant & Bakery in Fleminton, NJ;

- Meredith Tomason of RareSweets in Washington, DC;
- Jenny Torrence of NOTO Burrito in Topeka, KS;
- Erika Urso-Deutsch of Love Bites by Erika in Easton, PA;
- Rahul Vinod of RASA Indian Grill in Wshington, DC;
- Gretchen Von Cloedt of Hometown Desserts in Bradenton, FL;
- Bonnie Warford of Earl's Grocery in Charlotte, NC;
- Alfred Warren of NGenious DZines in Tulsa, OK;
- Mason Waterman of Rosa's Fresh Pizza in Philadelphia, PA;
- Bob Watson of Capitol Grounds Café and 802 Coffee Roasters in Montpelier, VT;
- Bryan Weaver of Butcher and Bee in Nashville, TN;
- Ken Weinstein of Trolley Car Diner of Philadelphia, PA;

- Jodi Whalen of August First in Burlington, VT;
- Rocco Whalen of Fahrenheit in Cleveland, OH;
- Joshua White of Swiss Haus Bakery in Philadelphia, PA;
- Robert Wiedmaier of RW Restaurant Group in Kensington, MD;
- Michael Wiley of Big Tree Hospitality in Porland, ME;
- Charlie Wilfong of Cuisine East and West in Cincinnati, OH;
- Timothy Williams of TW's-AFAB Catering in Tulsa, OK;
- Perrin Williams of Vermont Cake Studio in Waterbury Center, VT;
- Alex Wirth of Lucky's in Boulder, CO;
- Constance Wolgast of Ginny's and Jane E's in Anna Maria, FL;
- Andrew Wood of Russet Restaurant in Philadelphia, PA;

- Kristin Wood of Russet Restaurant in Philadelphia, PA;
- Ken Woytisek of The Culinary Institute of America of Saint Helena, CA;
- Jeffrey Zak of Jeff Zak Catering in Plymouth, MI;
- Johannah Zuniga of Dream Cakes in Portland, OR;
- Peggy Zwerver of Earth Bread + Brewery in Philadelphia, PA.